Draft version December 26, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style AASTeX6 v. 1.0

arXiv:1610.09505v2 [astro-ph.GA] 23 Dec 2016

GRAVITATIONAL WAVES FROM MERGING INTERMEDIATE-MASS BLACK HOLES : II EVENT RATES AT GROUND-BASED DETECTORS

Hisa-aki Shinkai[1]
Dept. of Information Science and Technology, Osaka Institute of Technology, Kitayama 1-79-1, Hirakata City, Osaka 573-0196, Japan

Nobuyuki Kanda[2]
Dept. of Physics, Osaka City University, Sugimoto 3-3-138, Sumiyoshi, Osaka City, Osaka 558-8585, Japan

Toshikazu Ebisuzaki[3]
Computational Astrophysics Laboratory, Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Hirosawa 2-1, Wako City, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

[1]hisaaki.shinkai@oit.ac.jp
[2]kanda@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp
[3]ebisu@riken.jp

ABSTRACT

Based on a dynamical formation model of a super-massive black-hole (SMBH), we estimate expected observational profile of gravitational wave at ground-based detectors, such as KAGRA or advanced LIGO/VIRGO. Focusing that the second generation of detectors have enough sensitivity from 10 Hz and up (especially with KAGRA due to its location at less seismic noise), we are able to detect the ring-down gravitational wave of a BH of the mass $M < 2 \times 10^3 M_\odot$. This enables us to check the sequence of BH mergers to SMBH via intermediate-mass black-holes (IMBHs). We estimate the number density of galaxies from halo formation model, and estimate the number of BH mergers from giant molecular cloud model assuming hierarchical growth of merged cores. At the designed KAGRA (and/or advanced LIGO/VIRGO), we find that the BH mergers of its total mass $M \sim 60 M_\odot$ is at the peak of the expected mass distribution. With its signal-to-noise ratio $\rho = 10(30)$, we estimate the event rate $R \sim 200(20)$ per year in the most optimistic case, and we also find that BH mergers of the range $M < 150 M_\odot$ are $R > 1$ per year for $\rho = 10$. Thus if we observe a BH with more than $100 M_\odot$ in future gravitational wave observations, our model naturally explains its source. [a]

Keywords: (Galaxy:) globular clusters: general — stars: black holes — (galaxies:) quasars: super-massive black holes — gravitational waves

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Era of gravitational wave astronomy*

The direct detections of gravitational waves were announced by the advanced LIGO group in 2016 (Abbott et al. 2016a,b), and we are at the opening era of "gravitational wave astronomy". LIGO group reported two events (GW150914, GW151226) and one transient event (LVT151012), all of three are regarded as the events of coalescence of binary black holes (BBHs).

The first event (GW150914) was the merger of BHs of the masses $36.2^{+5.2}_{-3.8} M_\odot$ and $29.1^{+3.7}_{-4.4} M_\odot$, which turned into a single BH of $62.3^{+3.7}_{-3.1} M_\odot$ with spin $a = 0.68^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$, which shows the energy radiation rate is 4.6% of the total mass. The event occurred at redshift $z = 0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$, and detected with signal-to-noise ratio $\rho = 23.7$. The second event (GW151226) was the merger of BHs with $14.2^{+8.3}_{-3.7} M_\odot$ and $7.5^{+2.3}_{-2.3} M_\odot$, which turned into a single BH of $20.8^{+6.1}_{-1.7} M_\odot$ with spin $a = 0.74^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$, which shows the energy radiation rate is 4.1% of the total mass. The event occurred at redshift $z = 0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$, and detected with $\rho = 13.0$ (These numbers were taken from Abbott et al. (2016c)).

[a] Submitted to Astrophysical Journal.
arXiv:1610.09505. Revised version.

These announcements were valuable not only on the point of the direct detections of the gravitational wave, but also the first results of confirming the existence of BH, the existence of BH of this mass range, and the existence of BBHs. Especially, the existence of $\sim 30 M_\odot$ BHs was surprising to the community, since there were no such observational evidences ever.

1.2. *Possible sources of 30 $M_\odot$ BHs*

Traditional scenario for forming BBHs are common envelope evolution of primordial binary massive stars (Belczynski et al. 2007), and dynamical formation in dense star clusters (Portegies Zwart & McMillan 2000).

Several groups reported possible scenarios for making 30 $M_\odot$ BHs. Kinugawa et al. (2014, 2016) proposed to use population III stars to form BBHs. Existence of population III stars is yet to be confirmed, but they show a typical BH mass of this model is at $\sim 30 M_\odot$ (chirp mass $\sim 60 M_\odot$), and the event rate would be 500 yr^{-1} (50 yr^{-1} for $\rho \geq 20$) (Nakano et al. 2015).

Recently, Fujii et al. (2016) estimate BH mergers combining their N-body simulations, modeling of globular clusters, and cosmic star-cluster formation history, and find that BH mass distribution has a peak at 10 $M_\odot$ and 50 $M_\odot$, and event rate for designed LIGO is at most 85 yr^{-1}.

In this article, based on a forming scenario of a supermassive black-hole (SMBH), we extend the previous model to a sequence of intermediate-mass black-hole (IMBHs), and estimate their observational detectability at ground-based gravitational wave detectors.

1.3. *SMBH runaway path*

Formation process of a SMBH is one of the unsolved problem in galaxy evolution history. Many possible routes were suggested by Rees (1978) long ago, but we still debate a plausible route. We do not yet know whether the first generation of BHs are of stellar-mass size or super-massive size. See, e.g., Volonteri (2012); Haiman (2013) for a review.

One of the simplest scenario for forming a SMBH is from the direct collapse of gas clouds or supermassive stars, or massive discs (e.g. Umemura et al. (1993); Loeb & Rasio (1994); Shibata & Shapiro (2002); Bromm & Loeb (2004); Begelman, Volonteri & Rees (2006); Begelman, Rossi & Armitage (2008)). Another scenario is by accretions on to, or mergers of, the remnants of Population III stars (e.g. Haiman & Loeb (2001); Volonteri & Begelman (2010); Johnson et al. (2012, 2013)). Recent studies suggest that we can construct a formation route of SMBHs without contradicting with current observations.

We, in this article, take the third route: accumulations of BHs. This route was came to be believed when IMBH (10^2–$10^3 M_\odot$) was first discovered in a starburst galaxy M82 (Matsumoto et al. 2001; Matsushita et al. 2000). So far, many IMBHs are found in the center of galaxies (see a review, e.g. Greene (2012); Yagi (2012)), and also the existence of an IMBH of $10^4 M_\odot$ close to the Sgr A* is recently reported (Tsuboi et al. 2016) (see also Portegies Zwart et al. (2006); Fujii et al. (2008)).

This runaway path was first proposed by Ebisuzaki et al. (2001). The scenario consists of three steps: (1) formation of IMBHs by runaway mergers of massive stars in dense star clusters (Portegies Zwart et al. 2004), (2) accumulations of IMBHs at the center region of a galaxy due to sinkages of clusters by dynamical friction, and (3) mergers of IMBHs by multi-body interactions and gravitational radiation. Successive mergers of IMBHs likely to form a SMBH with a mass of heavier than $> 10^6 M_\odot$. Ebisuzaki et al. (2001) predicted the IMBH-IMBH or IMBH-SMBH merging events can be observed on the order of one per month or even one per week.

Numerical simulations support the above first step (Marchant & Shapiro 1980; Portegies Zwart et al. 1999; Portegies Zwart & McMillan 2002; Portegies Zwart et al. 2004; Holger & Makino 2003), and the second step is also confirmed in a realistic mass-loss model (Matsubayashi et al. 2007), while the third step is not yet investigated in detail. The discovery of a SMBH binary system (Sudou et al. 2003) together with a simulation of an eccentric evolution of SMBH binaries (Iwasawa et al. 2010) support this formation scenario through merging of IMBHs.

1.4. *IMBH and gravitational waves*

In Matsubayashi et al. (2004) (Paper I, hereafter), we pointed out that gravitational-wave from IMBHs can be a trigger to prove this process. If the space-based laser interferometers are in action, then their observation ranges (10^{-4}–10 Hz) are quite reasonable for IMBH mergers. By accumulating data of merger events, we can distinguish the IMBH merger scenario such as they merge hierarchically or monopolistically.

Later, Fregeau et al. (2006) discussed the event rates of IMBH-IMBH binary observations at advanced LIGO and VIRGO, and concluded that we can expect $\sim$ 10 mergers a year. This work was followed by Gair et al. (2011) including the Einstein Telescope project. Amaro-Seoane & Santamaria (2010) also concern the IMBH-IMBH system including pre-merger phase.

Focusing that the second generation of GW interferometers have enough sensitivity at 10 Hz and above (see Fig.1), we are able to detect the ring-down gravitational wave of a BH of the mass $M < 2 \times 10^3 M_\odot$.

In this article, we therefore discuss how much we can



Figure 1. Designed strain noise amplitude of the advanced detectors (advanced LIGO, advanced VIRGO, and KAGRA), and planned Einstein Telescope. We also plotted that of torsion-balance antenna (TOBA).

observe BH mergers by finding their rind-down part using designed ground-based detectors. We roughly assume the mass distribution of BHs, $N(M)$, in a galaxy or globular cluster, which would be related to the merging history of BHs, and estimate the event rate using the designed strain noise of KAGRA, which is at the equivalent level with aLIGO/aVIRGO.

In addition, recent approaches to gravitational wave detection using a torsion-bar antenna (TOBA; (Ando et al. 2010; Ishidoshiro et al. 2011)) also quite attractive for this purpose since it covers the low frequency range (0.1 Hz $\sim$ 10 Hz). However, the current strain noise amplitude of TOBA is larger compare to those of interferometers (see Fig.1), and we do not discuss the case of TOBA in this article.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In §2, we present the basic equations of gravitational radiation from IMBH binaries. In §3, we estimate the event rate of IMBH mergers under the simplest assumptions on galaxy distribution and formation process of SMBH. Summary and discussion are presented in §4. Throughout the paper, we use c and G for the light speed and gravitational constant, respectively.

2. BLACK HOLE MERGER MODEL

2.1. *Ring-down frequency from BH*

Gravitational waveform of binary-star merger which ends up with a single BH has typical three phases; inspiral phase, merging phase, and ring-down phase. The waveform in the inspiral phase is called as a "chirp signal" from its feature of increasing frequency and amplitude. For the case of GW150914, the frequency was first caught at 35 Hz, then it increased to 150 Hz, where the amplitude reached the maximum which indicates the merger of the binary. The final "ring-down" signal was supposed to be around 300 Hz.

As we mentioned in Paper I, for massive BH binaries with masses greater than $10^3 M_\odot$, the inspiral frequencies are less than 1 Hz. The wavelength of this frequency range is apparently more than the size of the Earth, so that its detection requires interferometers in space. On the other hand, the ring-down frequency is simply estimated by the quasi-normal frequency of BH, $f_R + if_I$, which is determined from the mass and spin of the final BH, and is estimated higher frequency than its inspiral phase. The quasi-normal modes are derived as eigenvalues of the wave equations on the perturbed geometry (see e.g. Leaver (1985)). For a BH with mass M_T and spin a, fitting functions are also known (Echeverria (1989); Berti et al. (2006)) in the form

$$f_R = f_1 + f_2(1-a)^{f_3} \tag{1}$$

$$Q \equiv \frac{f_R}{2f_I} = q_1 + q_2(1-a)^{q_3} \tag{2}$$

where Q is called the quality factor, and f_i, q_i are fitting coefficients. For the most fundamental mode, which is of the spherical harmonic index $\ell = 2$, $m = 2$, the fitting parameters are $f_1 = 1.5251, f_2 = -1.1568, f_3 = 0.1292, q_1 = 0.7000, q_2 = 1.4187$, and $q_3 = -0.4990$ (Berti et al. (2006)). Recovering the units, we can write the frequency as

$$f_{\rm qnm} = \frac{c^3}{2\pi G M_T} f_R \sim 3.2 \left(\frac{10 M_\odot}{M_T}\right) f_R[{\rm kHz}]. \tag{3}$$

We plot $f_{\rm qnm}$ in Fig.2.

Supposing that advanced GW interferometers can detect $f_{\rm qnm}$ above 10 Hz, then BHs less than 1200 $M_\odot$ are within the target if BHs are non-rotating ($a = 0$), while BHs less than $2500 M_\odot$ are in the detectable range for highly rotating cases ($a = 0.98$).

With this simple estimation, we hereafter consider mergers of BHs with those total mass is less than 2000 $M_\odot$.

2.2. *Numbers of Galaxies in the Universe*

In order to model the typical mass of galaxies and its distribution, We apply halo mass function discussed by Vale & Ostriker (2006) in which they discuss an empirically based, non-parametric model for galaxy luminosities with halo/subhalo masses. They apply Sheth-Tormen mass function (Sheth & Tormen 1999) for halo number density,

$$n_H(M)dM = 0.322 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu^{0.6}}\right) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{d\nu}{dM} \exp\left(-\frac{\nu^2}{2}\right) dM \tag{4}$$

where $\nu = \sqrt{a}\delta_c(1+z)\sigma(M)$ with $a = 0.707$, the linear threshold for spherical collapse $\delta_c = 1.686$, and $\sigma(M)$ is the variance on the mass scale M. This mass function is roughly $\sim M^{-1.95}$ at low mass.



Figure 2. The quasi normal frequency $f_{\rm qnm}$ as a function of the mass of BH M_T. If we restrict the observable range is above 10 Hz for the advanced ground-based interferometers, then the BHs which mass are less than 2000 $M_\odot$ are within the target.



Figure 3. Global mass functions for halo (halo and subhalo), $n_H(M)$, for $z = 0, 0.1, 0.5, 2, 4, 5$ [eq.(4)]. $n_H(M)$ in units of $h^4/{\rm Mpc}^3/M_\odot$. M in units of $h^{-1}M_\odot$, $h = 0.7$.

Vale & Ostriker (2006) also derive an average number of galaxies (subhalos) predicted for a parent halo of mass, which is roughly given by $N_{\rm subhalo} \sim M^{0.9}$ (Fig.12 in their paper). If we regard this relation as a seed of galaxies, then it indicates a typical galaxy has mass $10^{11} - 10^{12} M_\odot$.

Integrating (4) by the volume as a function of redshift z, we can derive the number density of halo. In this process, we use the standard cosmology model with current parameters, i.e. we use flat Friedmann model with Hubble constant H_0=72 km/s/Mpc, matter and dark matter density $\Omega_{m0} = 0.27$, and dark energy (cosmological constant) $\Omega_{d0} = 0.73$. The luminosity distance $d_L(z)$ is given by

$$d_L(z) = (1+z)\int_0^z \frac{c\,dz}{H(z)} \tag{5}$$

where

$$H(z) = H_0\sqrt{(1+z)^3\Omega_{m0} + \Omega_{d0}}. \tag{6}$$

The volume of the Universe is $V(d) = 4\pi d^3/3$.



Figure 4. Number density of galaxy, $n_{\rm galaxy}(M)$.

Combining these two functions (average number of galaxies and the number density of halo), we get the number density of galaxy $n_{\rm galaxy}(M, z)$, which we show in Fig.4. If we integrate it by M and z as

$$N_{\rm galaxy}(z) = \int_0^z dz \int_{M_1}^{M_2} n_{\rm galaxy}(M, z) dM, \tag{7}$$

then we get the number of galaxies. We set $M_1 = 10^9 M_\odot$ and $M_2 = 10^{13} M_\odot$.

From the recent ultra-violet luminosity density of star forming galaxies, star formation rate density $\rho_{\rm SFR}(z)$ is fit as

$$\rho_{\rm SFRp}(z) = \frac{0.009 + 0.27(z/3.7)^{2.5}}{1 + (z/3.7)^{7.4}} + 10^{-3} \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_{\rm SFRr}(z) = \frac{0.009 + 0.27(z/3.4)^{2.5}}{1 + (z/3.4)^{8.3}} + 10^{-4} \tag{9}$$

for metal poor stars and metal rich stars, respectively (Robertson et al. 2010). If we sum these two (normalized $\rho_{\rm SFRp}$ and normalized $\rho_{\rm SFRr}$) evenly, the peak location is at $z = 3.26$. We then obtain

$$N_{\rm galaxy}(z) = \int_0^z \rho_{\rm SFR}(z) dz \int_{M_1}^{M_2} n_{\rm galaxy}(M, z) dM. \tag{10}$$

The typical numbers of our model are shown in Table.1. These numbers are slightly larger than the latest observation by Conselice et al. (2016), but our model produces the same order and its evolution history for $N_{\rm galaxy}$ with them.

Table 1. Typical numbers of our galaxy model: the number of galaxy $N_{\rm galaxy}(z)$, eq. (10), and the number density of galaxy $n_{\rm galaxy}$.

z	$N_{\rm galaxy}(z)$	$n_{\rm galaxy}$	
1	1.18×10^{9}	1.0×10^{-3}/Mpc^3	for $z<1$
2	9.45×10^{10}	6.5×10^{-3}/Mpc^3	for $1<z<2$
3	5.23×10^{12}	2.4×10^{-2}/Mpc^3	for $2<z<3$

2.3. *Numbers of BHs in a galaxy*

We next estimate a number of BH candidates in a galaxy. Recently, Inutsuka et al. (2015) developed a scenario of galactic-scale star formation from a giant molecular cloud. Their model includes both growth of molecular clouds and destruction of magnetized molecular clouds by radiation. Simulations and steady state analysis show that mass density function of molecular clouds, $n_{\rm cl}(M_g)$, converges at the Schechter-like function,

$$n_{\rm cl}(M_{\rm cl}) \sim M_{\rm cl}^{-1.7}\exp\left(-\frac{M_{\rm cl}}{M_{\rm cut}}\right) \tag{11}$$

where the cut-off mass $M_{\rm cut}=10^6M_\odot$.

On the other hand, many N-body simulations report that there is a simple relation between the mass of the most massive cluster $m_{\rm max}$ and the total mass of the molecular cloud $M_{\rm cl}$,

$$m_{\rm max}=0.20M_{\rm cl}^{0.76}. \tag{12}$$

The single line fit can be seen for the wide range $M_{\rm cl}/M_\odot = 10^0-10^7$ (see Fig.6 in Fujii & Portegies Zwart (2015)).

We therefore combine these results, and suppose each molecular cloud forms a single BH in its core if it is more than $10M_\odot$, and suppose these BHs become "building blocks" of forming stellar-sized and intermediated-mass BHs. Many N-body simulations suggest that massive objects will accumulate in the center of galaxy due to dynamical friction, so that we modeled that these seed BHs accumulate and merge repeatedly (as we model below), resulting in IMBHs and SMBHs. We do not specify where these mergers occur, but we count our BH mergers after we set up the initial seeds. We show the number density of BHs in a galaxy, $n_{\rm BH}(M_{\rm BH})$ in Fig. 5.

2.4. *Numbers of BH mergers in a galaxy*

In Paper I, we considered two toy models for formation of SMBHs: hierarchical growth and runaway growth. The hierarchical growth model is the case that each two nearby equal mass BHs merge simultaneously, and continue their mergers. The runaway growth model is, conversely, only one BH grows itself by continual mergers with surrounding BH companions.



Figure 5. Number density of BHs per galaxy as a function of BH mass for different total mass of galaxy $M_{\rm galaxy}=10^9M_\odot,\cdots,10^{12}M_\odot$.

The recent N-body simulations report that hierarchical merger process is plausible both for the massive clusters (10^4-$10^6M_\odot$) (see e.g. Fujii & Portegies Zwart (2015)) and for stellar-mass BHs (see e.g. Fujii et al. (2016)).

We therefore simply assume that BHs formed at cores of clouds will accumulate each other hierarchically, i.e. the mass and the number of BHs at step from k to $k+1$ can be expressed simply by

$$M_{k+1}=2M_k, \tag{13}$$
$$N_{k+1}=N_k/2. \tag{14}$$

The mass of BH merger, then, obeys the distribution M^{-1} (see footnote [1]).

On the other hand, we know empirically the mass of the center BH of the galaxy, $M_{\rm SMBH}$, and the total mass of the galaxy, $M_{\rm galaxy}$, has a relation

$$M_{\rm SMBH}=2\times10^{-4}M_{\rm galaxy} \tag{15}$$

(or equal to 10^{-3} of the bulge mass, see e.g. King (2003); McConnell & Ma (2013)).

Combining these facts, for a certain galaxy with $M_{\rm galaxy}$, we pick up BHs of which total mass is $M_{\rm SMBH}$ (equation above), obeying its mass distribution of Fig.5. We suppose pick-upped BHs will form a SMBH in its series of mergers in hierarchical model. Together with galaxy distribution function $n_{\rm galaxy}(M,z)$, we are able to count the possible events of BH mergers, $N_{\rm merger}(M_{\rm BH},z)$, in the Universe, which we show in Fig.6.

In the next section, we further take into account the detectors' detectable distance $D(M,a,\rho)$ (that corre-

[1] Suppose we have a cluster of the total mass M_c which consists of N_0 equal-mass BHs. This means that each BH mass is initially M_c/N_0. They continue to form binaries and merge together, which indicates there are $N_0/2^{i-1}$ binaries for i-th generation which forms BHs with the masses $M=2^{i-1}M_c/N_0$. The model shows only discrete distribution of the BH mass, but the number of binaries $N(M)$ can be approximated with the number of initial fractions in a cluster, $N(M)=M_c/M$.



Figure 6. Cumulative distribution function of the number of BH mergers $N_{\rm merger}(M_{\rm BH})$ as a function of the redshift z. We express number with binned one, of which we binned 20 for one order in $M_{\rm BH}$.

sponds to BH spin parameter a, energy emission rate of merger, signal-to-noise ratio ρ). In §4, we estimate the observable event rate,

$$\text{Event Rate } R[/\text{yr}] = \frac{N_{\rm merger}(z)}{V(D/2.26)}, \tag{16}$$

where the factor 2.26 is for averaging the distance for all directions (Finn & Chernoff (1993)).

3. SIGNAL-TO-NOISE RATIO (SNR)

3.1. *SNR*

Let the true signal $h(t)$, the function of time, is detected as a signal, $s(t)$, which also includes the unknown noise, $n(t)$:

$$s(t) = h(t) + n(t). \tag{17}$$

The standard procedure for the detection is judged by the optimal signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), ρ, which is given by

$$\rho = 2\left[\int_0^\infty \frac{\tilde{h}(f)\,\tilde{h}^*(f)}{S_n(f)} df\right]^{1/2}, \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{h}(f)$ is the Fourier-transformed quantity of the wave,

$$\tilde{h}(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i f t}\, h(t)\, dt, \tag{19}$$

and $S_n(f)$ the (one-sided) power spectral density of strain noise of the detector, as we showed in Fig. 1. In this paper, for KAGRA (bKAGRA), we use a fitted function

$$\sqrt{S_n(f)} = 10^{-26}\left(\frac{6.5\times10^{10}}{f^8} + \frac{6\times10^6}{f^{2.3}} + 1.5f\right), \tag{20}$$

where f is measured in Hz, as was used in Nakano et al. (2015).

3.2. *SNR of ringdown wave*

For the ringdown gravitational wave in presence of a black hole, the waveform is modeled as

$$h(t) = A\cos(2\pi f_R(t-t_0)+\psi_0)e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau} \tag{21}$$

where f_R is the oscillation frequency, and τ is the decaying time constant, t_0 and ψ_0 are the initial time and its phase, respectively (we simply set $t_0 = \psi_0 = 0$). The parameter τ is normally expressed using a quality factor, $Q \equiv \pi f_R \tau$, or $f_I = 1/(2\pi\tau)$. The waveform, (21), is then written as

$$h(t) \sim A e^{i2\pi(f_R + i f_I)t} \tag{22}$$

where we call $f_R + i f_I$ quasi-normal frequency, which is obtained from the perturbation analysis of black hole, and its fitting equations are shown in (3).

Following Flanagan & Hughes (1998), we use the energy spectrum formula for the ringdown wave

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dE}{df} &= \frac{A^2M^2f^2}{32\pi^3\tau^2} \\ &\times\left\{\frac{1}{[(f-f_R)^2+f_I^2]^2} + \frac{1}{[(f+f_R)^2+f_I^2]^2}\right\} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{8}A^2M^2 f_R Q\;\delta(f-f_R)\,[1+O(1/Q)]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where M is the total mass of the binary, $M = m_1 + m_2$. We then obtain

$$E_{\rm ringdown} \approx \frac{1}{8}A^2M^2 f_R Q. \tag{24}$$

Let $\epsilon_r(a) \equiv E_{\rm ringdown}/M$, which expresses the energy fraction of the emitted gravitation wave to the total mass. As we cited in the introduction, GW150914 and GW151226 show us $a = 0.67, 0.74$ and energy emission rate $4.6\%, 4.1\%$ of the total mass, respectively. The associated numerical simulation of GW150914 (SXS:BBH:0305) [2] shows that the 4.0% of the total mass is emitted before the merger [3]. That is, the ring-down part emits the energy around 0.6 % of the total mass. If we use $A \sim 0.4$, then we recover the ratio $\epsilon_r(0.67) = 0.58\%$ (it also produces e.g. $\epsilon_r(0.0) = 0.236\%$, $\epsilon_r(0.5) = 0.425\%$, $\epsilon_r(0.9) = 1.23\%$, $\epsilon_r(0.98) = 2.98\%$). The magnitude of this A is also consistent with the quadrupole formula.

The SNR is, then, expressed using the inertial mass $\mu = m_1m_2/M$ and the redshift of the source z,

$$\rho^2 = \frac{8}{5}\frac{\epsilon_r(a)}{f_R^2}\frac{(1+z)M}{S_h(f_R/(1+z))}$$

[2] SXS Gravitational Waveform Database (https://www.black-holes.org/waveforms/)

[3] We thank Hiroyuki Nakano for pointing out this ratio.



Figure 7. SNR for ring-down waves from a black hole with spin parameter a which appears at the distance 1 Gpc. Figures (a) and (b) are for KAGRA and Einstein Telescope, respectively. We see that ring-down frequencies of IMBH (especially for 100–400 $M_\odot$) are the best target for both KAGRA and Einstein Telescope. Figure (c) is for TOBA and the distance is estimated at 100 Mpc.

$$\times \left(\frac{(1+z)M}{d_L(z)}\right)^2 \left(\frac{4\mu}{M}\right)^2 . \qquad (25)$$

Up to here, we see SNR is larger when the black hole spin a is large, and has the maximum when $m_1 = m_2$.

In Fig 7, we plot SNR of ring-down waves from a BH at the distance 1 Gpc at KAGRA for $A = 0.4$. The results depends on the BH spin parameter a, but we see that ring-down frequencies of IMBH (especially for 100–400 $M_\odot$) are the best target for both KAGRA and Einstein Telescope.

3.3. *Detectable distance*

By specifying the BH mass and spin, together with ρ, then we can find the distance d_L which satisfies eq. (25). We call this distance detectable distance $D(M, a, \rho)$.



Figure 8. Detectable distance D of the ring-down signal at KAGRA. SNR is set to (a) 10 and (b) 100.

We converted Fig.7 into the plots of detectable distance D with a function of BH mass M for SNR=10 and 100. We show them in Fig.8 for KAGRA. We see the designed KAGRA covers at least 100 (10) Mpc at SNR=10 (100) for $10M_\odot < M$, and KAGRA covers 1Gpc at SNR=10 for $40M_\odot < M < 1000M_\odot$.

4. EVENT RATE

Using the detectable distance $D(M, a, \rho)$ obtained in the previous section, we set the upper limit of z for integrating eq. (10) to obtain the numbers of galaxies, $N_{\rm galaxy}$, and then obtain the number of BH mergers, $N_{\rm merger}$, according to the procedure shown in §2. We show $N_{\rm merger}$ in Fig. 9 (a1) and (b1) for SNR=10 and 30, respectively.

The event rate R, then, is estimated by eq. (16). We show them in Fig. 9 (a2) and (b2). Previous works (e.g., Miller (2002); Will (2004)) assume the number of events to the merger sources is roughly $\sim 10^{-10}$, which can be seen in our figures Fig. 9 (a1) and (a2) for higher spinning BH cases.

Fig. 9 is for specifying the BH spin parameter a, but if we assume that a is homogeneously distributed, then the averaged R is estimated as Fig. 10.



Figure 9. Number of BH mergers within the detectable distances (a1, b1) and event rate R (a2, b2) as a function of BH mass M with signal-to-noise ratio $\rho = 10$ and 30 for KAGRA. Three distributions for each figure are of $a = 0.9, 0.5$, and 0.0 (from largest to lowest), respectively.



Figure 10. Event rate R as a function of BH mass M with signal-to-noise ratio $\rho = 10$ for KAGRA. Spin parameter dependences are averaged.

The event rate versus mass distribution of Fig. 10 has its peak $R \sim 7.13$[/yr] at $M \sim 59.1 M_\odot$ (200–375 [Hz] for $a = 0$–0.9). It is interesting to find out this peak mass matches with the final BH mass of GW150914. The mergers of the range above $R > 1$ [/yr] is $40 M_\odot < M < 150 M_\odot$. The total number of events above $R > 1$ [/yr] is ~ 211.

Our event rate sounds similar with the other groups. For example, LIGO-Virgo group updated their estimated event rates after the detection of GW150914 as 2–600 $\mathrm{Gpc}^3\ \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ assuming BH mass distribution models as flat or power-law ($\sim M^{-2.35}$) (Abbott et al. 2016d). Kinugawa et al. (2014) estimate as 70–140 yr^{-1} from their Population III model. Inoue et al. (2016) estimate as $< 60\ \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from their BH merger model inferred from luminosity function of ultra-luminous X-ray sources. However, our model predicts BH mergers over $M > 100 M_\odot$, which will be a key to test our model in future.

5. SUMMARY

Based on a bottom up formation model of a super-massive black-hole (SMBH) via intermediate-mass black-holes (IMBHs), we estimate expected observational profile of gravitational wave at ground-based detectors. We simply modeled that cores of molecular clouds become BHs if it is more than 10 $M_\odot$, which become building blocks of forming larger BHs. We also modeled that BH mergers are accumulations of equal-mass ones and suppose these occurs hierarchically. We did not include gas accretion after a BH is formed.

At the designed KAGRA (or equivalent advanced LIGO/VIRGO), with the most standard criteria of the signal-to-noise ratio $\rho = 10$, we find the mass distribution of BH mergers has its peak at $M \sim 60 M_\odot$, and we can detect also BHs at the range $40 M_\odot < M < 150 M_\odot$ in a certain event rates.

Details numbers are, of course, depend on model settings and model parameters. We assume all the galaxies in the Universe evolve in the single scenario, which will over-estimate the event rate if some SMBHs are formed from the direct collapse of gas cloud. We also ignore galaxy mergers, which are another route of forming SMBHs. These issues will lower the merger event rates, so that our event rates can be understood at the maximum number. However, the profiles of event rates in terms of BH mass (Fig.10) will remain the same, therefore our model's feature, the existence of the gravitational wave events with BHs larger than 100 $M_\odot$, will be tested by accumulating actual events.

We conclude that the statistics of the signals will tell us both a galaxy distribution and a formation model of SMBHs, and also in future cosmological models/gravitational theories.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the anonymous referee for constructive suggestions. This work was supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the JSPS (C) No. 25400277 (HS), and also by MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas "New Developments in Astrophysics Through Multi-Messenger Observations of Gravitational Wave Sources" (No. 24103005) (NK).

REFERENCES

Abbott, B. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2016a, PhRvL, 116, 061102
Abbott, B. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2016b, PhRvL, 116, 241103
Abbott, B. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2016c, PhRevX 6, 041015
Abbott, B. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2016d, ApJL, 833, 1
Amaro-Seoane, P., & Santamaría, L. 2010, ApJ, 722, 1197
Ando, M., K. et al. 2010, PhRvL, 105, 161101
Begelman, M. C., Rossi, E. M., & Armitage, P. J. 2008, MNRAS, 387, 1649
Begelman, M. C., Volonteri, M., & Rees, M. J. 2006, MNRAS, 370, 289
Belczynski, K., Taam, R.E., Kalogera, V., Rasio, F.A., Bulik, T. 2007, ApJ, 662 504
Berti, E., Cardoso, V., & Will, C. M. 2006, PhRvD, 73, 064030
Bromm, V., & Loeb, A. 2004, New Astron. 9, 353 (astro-ph/0312456)
Conselice, C.J., Wilkinson, A., Duncan, K., & Mortlock, A. 2016, ApJ, 830 83
Ebisuzaki, T., et al. 2001, ApJL, 562, L19
Echeverria, F. 1980, PhRvD, 40, 3194
Finn, L. S. & Chernoff, D. F. 1993, PhRvD47, 2198
Flanagan, É. É., & Hughes. S. A., 1998, PhRvD, 57, 4535
Fregeau J. M., et al. 2006, ApJ, 646, L135
Fujii, M. S., Iwasawa, M., Funato, Y., & Makino, J. 2008, ApJ, 686, 1082
Fujii, M. S., & Portegies Zwart, S. 2015, MNRAS, 449, 726
Fujii, M. S., Tanikawa, A. & Makino, J. 2016, preprint.
Gair, J. R., Mandel, I., Coleman Miller, M., & Volonteri, M. 2011 Gen. Rel. Grav. 43 485 (arXiv:0907.5450)
Greene, J. 2012, Nature Comm. 3, 1304
Haiman, Z., & Loeb, A. 2001, ApJ, 552, 459
Haiman, Z. 2013, in Astrophysics and Space Science Library, Vol. 396, The First Galaxies, ed. T. Wiklind, B. Mobasher, & V. Bromm, 293 (arXiv:1203.6075)
Holger, B. & Makino, J., 2003, MNRAS, 304, 227
Inoue, Y., Tanaka, Y.T., & Isobe, N. 2016, MNRAS, 461, 4329
Inutsuka, S., Inoue, T., Iwasaki, K. & Hosokawa, T. 2015, A&A, 580, A49
Ishidoshiro, K., et al. 2011, PhRvL, 106, 161101
Iwasawa, M., An, S., Matsubayashi, T., Funato, Y., & Makino, J. 2010, arXiv:1011.4017
Johnson, J. L., Whalen, D. J., Fryer, C. L., & Li, H. 2012, ApJ, 750, 66
Johnson, J. L., Whalen, D. J., Li, H., & Holz, D. E. 2013, ApJ, 771, 116
King, A. 2003, ApJL, 596, L27
Kinugawa, T., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 442, 2963
Kinugawa, T., Miyamoto, A., Kanda, N. & Nakamura, T. 2016, MNRAS, 456, 1093
Leaver, E. W. 1985, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A402, 285
Loeb, A., & Rasio, F. A. 1994, ApJ, 432, 52
Marchant, A. B., & Shapiro, S. L., 1980, ApJ, 239, 685
Matsubayashi, T., Makino, J., & Ebisuzaki, T. 2007, ApJ, 656, 879
Matsubayashi, T., Shinkai, H., & Ebisuzaki, T. 2004, ApJ, 614, 864 (Paper I)
Matsumoto et al. 2001, ApJL, 547, L25
Matsushita et al. 2000, ApJL, 545, L107
McConnell, N. J., & Ma, C.P. 2013, ApJ, 764, 184
Miller, M. C. 2002, ApJ, 581, 438
Nakano, H., Tanaka, T., & Nakamura, T. 2015, PhRvD, 92, 064003
Portegies Zwart, S. F., Makino, J., McMillan, S. L. W., & Hut, P. 1999, A&A, 348, 117
Portegies Zwart, S. F., & McMillan, S. L. W. 2002, ApJ, 528, L17
Portegies Zwart, S. F., & McMillan, S. L. W. 2002, ApJ, 576, 899
Portegies Zwart, S. F., Holger, B., Piet, H., Makino, J., & McMillan, S. L. W. 2004, Nature, 428, 724
Portegies Zwart, S. F., et al. 2006, ApJ, 641, 319
Rees, M. J. 1978, Observatory 98, 210; Rees, M. J. 1984, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 22, 471
Robertson, B.E., Ellis, R.S., Dunlop, J.S., McLure, R.J., & Stark, D.P. 2010, Nature, 468 55
Robertson, B.E. & Ellis, R.S. 2012, ApJ, 744 95
Sheth, R.K., & Tormen, G. 1999, MNRAS, 308, 119
Shibata, M., & Shapiro, S. L. 2002, ApJ, 572, L39
Sudou, H., Iguchi, S., Murata. Y., & Taniguchi Y. 2003, Science, 300, 1263
Tsuboi, M. et al. 2016, PASJ, 68, L7
Umemura, M., Loeb, A., Turner, E. L. 1993, ApJ, 419, 459
Vale, A., & Ostriker, J.P. 2006, MNRAS, 371, 1173
Volonteri, M. 2012, Science, 337, 544
Volonteri, M., & Begelman, M.C. 2010, MNRAS, 409, 1022
Will, C. M. 2004, ApJ, 611, 1080
Yagi, K. 2012, Class. Quant. Grav. 29, 075005